

# EDITORIALS

## Heart Disease Costs

With diseases of the heart and circulation accounting for more than 800,000 deaths each year, or about 54 per cent of all deaths, the humanitarian considerations underlying the need for generous support of the 1958 Heart Fund are clearly apparent.

The story of death and human suffering, however, represents but one side of the coin. On the other side is the story having to do with the dollar-and-cents cost of heart disease, which is staggering.

At least 650,000 man years are lost to industry each year due to diseases of the heart and blood vessels—the equivalent in earnings of more than \$3 billion, and a loss in federal income tax revenue of nearly \$400 million.

Production losses created by these diseases far exceed those growing out of labor stoppages in any given year, and are about three-fifths of those caused by on-the-job accidents.

Whether it be in the factory, the office or the home, heart disease strikes ruthlessly, leaving in its wake not only human suffering but also serious economic loss.

So it follows that the fight against heart disease is everybody's concern. It is the fight of industry, business, labor, the family and the individual.

Our best hope of achieving victory over the heart diseases, with a reduction in the toll of lives as well as in economic waste, rests with your Heart Association and its balanced programs of research, education and community service.

Give generously to the 1958 Heart Fund. Help Your Heart Fund—Help Your Heart.

## Opinions of Others

Every time we dispatch a test rocket, we let everyone know whether it succeeds or fails. At this critical time, each failure seems greatly magnified. And we keep on having failures, despite the important success with a missile sent aloft in Florida not long ago.

But, we must remember that, as in World War II, Russia lets us hear only of its successes. The great curtain of secrecy it puts such store by keeps us from knowing of the failures. And no doubt they are very, very frequent. —Elgin (Ill.) Courier-News.

Once again the news has appeared that income taxes have been cut—but once again the dateline has been Canada. Which brings to mind the wry comment of Utah's famous tax crusader, J. Bracken Lee:

"Death and taxes are said to be unavoidable, but we are lucky that death does not get worse every time Congress meets." —Elk Grove (Calif.) Citizen.

The continued emphasis of crime in television programs accomplishes one end which few may realize. It has a tendency to cheapen life. Television characters "die" by the dozens every day in racket shows, westerns, highway stories, waterfront dramas, police case histories, etc. A young mind is impressed—the wrong way. —Garner (Iowa) Leader.

## Unemployment Facts

Twenty-two years ago the California Legislature enacted the California Unemployment Insurance Act (now Code) to enable creation of an employment security system. Through September of 1957 unemployment insurance benefit payments since the law's passage totaled \$1,899,725,342. The Unemployment Fund balance as of Sept. 30th stood at \$1,006,472,467.

The year 1957 also marked the 11th year since passage of California's disability insurance law, which was a 1946 amendment to the Unemployment Insurance Code. Disability insurance and hospital benefits payments under the State Plan through September, 1957, totaled \$364,165,199, and additional payments under voluntary plans and by self-insured employers as of September 30th had amounted to more than \$300,000,000.

Thus, a total of more than \$664,000,000 in disability insurance and hospital benefits have been paid out to California workers in the 11-year period. The Disability Fund balance as of Sept. 30th was \$143,989,802, plus another \$129,308,386 in the Unemployment Fund available for disability insurance payments.

Proper use of the unemployment insurance and disability insurance payments depends upon understanding of the law and its administration. This column will continue to offer authentic information supplied by the California Department of Employment and the worker's rights and responsibilities under the state Unemployment Insurance Code.

Readers may obtain a pamphlet on unemployment insurance by writing a card or letter to the Department of Employment, 1628 Cravens Ave., Torrance, California. There is no charge for this service.

## He Was An 'Underprivileged Child'

—BUT LUCKILY, ABE DIDN'T KNOW IT.



YOUR PROBLEMS by Ann Landers

## Leave the Corpse Alone

Dear Ann: I'm a highly respectable girl who was brought up to know the difference between right and wrong.

I fell in love with a waiter in a restaurant where I used to eat dinner when I wanted to splurge. The first night he took me out he admitted he was married and had a son. He didn't try to kid me. He's a very honest person.

He confided that he married this girl because she was pregnant although he didn't love her and she knew it. She wanted him for a husband regardless.

Their marriage was never a happy one and they talked about splitting up long before I came into the picture.

This man has asked me to marry him as soon as he can get a divorce, but I don't want people to think I broke up their home. What can I do to protect my reputation? —Dinah.

If the marriage is dead, and you don't want to be accused of killing it, don't hang around the corpse.

So long as the man is legally married he's not a suitable companion for you. Tell him IF and WHEN he's free, to let you know. Under the present circumstances you should have nothing to do with him.

Dear Ann: Christmas is long gone—but I'm still waiting to hear from some of my friends and relatives saying they received the gifts I sent.

For years I've remembered family and friends at graduation, on birthdays, anniversaries and at Christmas. More often than not, I must run into these people on the street or at a social function to learn whether or not my gift was received.

My husband says I'm overly sensitive and that I should not expect thanks. I am NOT looking for "thanks." Ann: I just want to know that the gift didn't get lost in the mails. Is this asking too much? Is my husband correct in saying that I place too much importance on the acknowledgement? Please tell me, Ruth.

Dear Ruth: People who send gifts should do so because they want to. There is great pleasure in the proper spirit of giving.

BUT—to receive a gift and not bother about acknowledging it, is positively boorish. It takes no longer to drop a line of thanks in the mail, or to pick up the telephone, than to unwrap the present.

In my opinion, after a reasonable period of time has elapsed and no acknowledgment has arrived, it's perfectly proper to phone the party and ask if the gift was received.

There's always a chance that it went astray, in which case, a tracer can be put on it. If the gift WAS received, and the party is red-faced be-

cause of his negligence, he's earned his discomfiture.

Dear Ann: I just read Mrs. G's letter and I am boiling. This woman gave her husband the divorce, but she made him pay through the nose by tying him financially for life.

My husband and I realized early in our marriage that it was a mistake. We had two children. I could have put him through the financial wringer because he wanted more than I did. But, I had a good position and knew I could manage with just a little support money for the children. I settled for the barest minimum and we parted the best of friends, with no bitterness.

I feel that marriage is a two-way street. I accept half the responsibility for the fact that our marriage failed.

In my opinion a woman who sticks the alimony dagger into a man is greedy and vindictive. Her ex-husband can have nothing but disdain for her, and she can have no respect for herself. —A Loser Who Won.

Confidentially: THE PLANNER: Don't marry for money. It's cheaper to borrow from the bank.

INQUIRING PARENTS: Twenty-five per cent of the paycheck is an excellent deal for children who are of age and living at home. Offer to let them try to do it elsewhere for less.

Dear Ann: Three years ago my husband divorced me, to marry a woman he'd been chasing around with for years. I decided in exchange for his freedom and the suffering he had caused me, I would tie him up financially for the rest of his life, which is exactly what I did.

A few months after the divorce I met a swell fellow. We have a lot in common and enjoy each other's company. My 18-year-old daughter calls him "Papa" and she's crazy about him. We've talked about getting married, but this alimony arrangement is so good I'd be a fool to give it up.

My boy friend comes over twice a week and spends week ends with me. Sometimes we go out, and sometimes we stay at home. Now the nosy neighbors are beginning to talk.

## My Neighbors



"Incidentally, fellows—what are they 'unfair' about?"

AFTER HOURS by John Morley

## Profit Sharing Idea Explored

Every now and then—especially during a business decline—the proposal creeps in from labor spokesmen that profits should be divided among workers, as well as stockholders and investors. It's been brought up again by Mr. Walter Reuther, president of the powerful auto workers' union, and vice president of the AFL-CIO. Mr. Reuther's proposal: "Share automobile profits with the workers as well as with stockholders and executives." Mr. Reuther also recommends a new one: that the car buyer also come in for a split of the profits through a rebate on the purchase of his car, when the company profits exceed a certain figure arrived at by Mr. Reuther's labor economists. On the surface these schemes sound plausible and we presume that many workers and others will fall for it. We hope our readers won't.

Our interpretation of "profit-sharing" is that if profits are available from any business by those who took a chance with their savings invested in the venture which produced the profits. If no profits, but losses, were shared, investors would share the losses as well. Mr. Reuther and others who advocate "sharing the profits" never bring up the question of sharing the losses. It is this important element of "risk" which is generally overlooked in discussing the "sharing profits."

Labor officials constantly raise the point that executives are given "profit-sharing" incentives and why should not workers be offered the same thing. Spokesmen confuse the issue by inconsistent definitions and comparisons between the executive and the worker. Although both are employees in the general sense of classification, there is one very important difference between the two.

The executive is given a "profit-sharing" incentive only if he helps to "organize" a profit. This profit is "organized" by efficiency, design, sales and marketing superiority over the competitors, economy in operation, etc. It is management which "organizes" the whole operation, provides new machines and equipment, and invests the capital. If it fails to make a profit, it is removed—and the stockholders and investors bring in other executives to run the business. Labor is not as directly affected. It would be if it could increase production and reduce costs. Recent "profit-sharing" proposals never mentioned anything about increased production. They propose only increased wages.

A factory worker is guaranteed a specified wage, regard-

less of profit or loss. Wages are not always paid out of profits, but out of savings, or reserves. Since profits are the amount remaining to owners of a business after payment of wages and costs, it cannot at the same time remain a figure from which additional wages are to be paid. Profits are something over and above wages, accruing to the owners of a business who gambled their funds in the business venture. If labor wants a share in the profits, over and above the cost of doing business—then labor should invest in the business and take the same chances as those who do.

There is only one way for a worker to share in the surplus profits and that is by becoming a part-owner. He then profits by his labor as well as by his investment if the company succeeds. What labor leaders often overlook is that hazard-capital has provided the tools which have made production so abundant at less physical effort for the worker and the many benefits that flow to the worker through higher production, lower prices and higher wages.

Mr. Reuther and other labor spokesmen are felling the nation again that "we are in trouble because big business is taking a disproportionately large share of the fruits of our developing economy. What is needed is higher take-home pay for workers and lower take-home profits for corporations." This charge of "exorbitant profits" is like another popular theory of certain labor leaders, that of "purchasing power" to justify demands for wage increases. They use both of these theories on the expediency of the moment. During a period of full employment and excessive spending by workers, "the raise-wages-to-create-more-purchasing-power theory" is dropped in favor of the "exorbitant profits theory."

The whole idea that corporation profits can be dipped into indiscriminately for higher wages is a myth. Any substantial increase in the wage scale must come from profits. This seriously affects three important categories: 1. Reduces revenue to the U. S. treasury, resulting in a certain increase in public taxes. 2. Lower earnings to stockholders and subsequent withdrawal of invested capitals from industry. 3. A reduction of reinvestment in industrial expansion and improvements which will reduce employment and probably increase the physical effort of labor with inefficient machinery and equipment.

The charge of "exorbitant profits" simply does not hold up. U. S. Department of Commerce figures for the first

half of 1957 reveal that net income after taxes of all U. S. corporations has declined since 1948. In 1948 the national income was 221 billion dollars and the net income of all corporations was 22 billion dollars, or 9.2% of the total. In 1957 the national income rose to 356 billion dollars and the net corporate income stands at only 21 billion dollars, 5.9% of the total.

At the recent AFL-CIO convention both Mr. Reuther and Mr. Meany declared that the nation reached its high income because of wage increases won by organized labor. This is not so. If true that the road to prosperity was reached simply in increasing wages, all we have to do now is to double or triple the present wages to really begin to live it up. But labor leaders know what every economist knows, that economic progress and prosperity come only from increased production. Wages are paid out of this production. When wage advances outstrip productivity—as has been the case in recent years—the result is rising costs and inflation. This is always reflected in price increases that rob the worker of his increased income, and in profit-shrinkage that dulls the edge of capital investment.

In this stupid tug-of-war between false economic theories and sound ones, the real victims are those on fixed incomes—the elderly, retired citizens, unable to find a seat on the band-wagon of inflationary wages and prices.

It is true that some businesses voluntarily set up "profit-sharing" programs with their employees as added incentives, when the "climate" and nature of the business warrants it. The "climate" in these instances between labor and management is amiable and mutually advantageous. But under the "climate" of some labor unions—with violence, threats, coercion, strikes, hatreds, excessive wage demands and socialization schemes, there is hardly room, or profits, left to share with anybody.

The scheme of "share profits" with consumers, even more ridiculous, for it upsets the whole free enterprise system under which America became great. Mr. Reuther and his socialist planners for a starter demand that General Motors share their profits with their consumers, who bought Chevrolets, Buicks and Frigidaires. Tomorrow the planners will demand that department store owners, gas station owners, milkmen, real estate agents—why not everybody—rebate to their customers a part of their profits at the end of each year.

But the question again comes up—who will share the losses?

THE FREELANCER by Tom Rische

## Just What Do You Do With Junior?

Who's the boss in your home?

Is it Mom or Pop? Or is it —no—or could it be Junior?

Everybody will admit that children can be little tyrants, especially when they're babies. They cry at all hours of the day and night, need changing periodically, and need to be kept under the watchful eye of Mom or Pop lest they get into trouble.

Mom and Pop's schedule is thoroughly regulated by the needs of their offspring, especially when the youngsters are young. Even when they decide to have the evening out, there is always the problem of The Babysitter.

These little fellows are costly, too—with clothes that suddenly get too small, doctors to pay, milk by the gallon, and bassinets and all the other paraphernalia that goes with a child.

Junior's schedule pretty well regulates the household during his early years, but whether it does so in later years depends on the parents. Their views may range from the "don't disturb him because you might warp his little personality" school to the cull of "spare the rod and spoil the child."

The modern trend, however, leans less toward the rod and more toward psychology. The trouble is, however, that Junior, too, uses

psychology on his parents and it sometimes comes down to the point where it's a war of competing psychologies.

A notable example of this was the woman who wrote to Ann Landers reporting that her home had been in chaos ever since they adopted "democracy," with each member of the family getting one vote. The woman and her husband found themselves constantly outvoted by their four children.

Children are usually the apple of their parents' eyes.

Recent theories have tended to make the average parent wonder whether his upbringing might not have had something to do with the fact that he doesn't amount to more than he does. Therefore, many of them have tried giving Junior more rope and seeing what he does with it.

Advertisers have hopped on the bandwagon, bombarding little minds with the names of products that Mommy and Daddy should buy. The result is little voices piping, "Momma, buy me some Crunchie-Wunchies with the toy boats inside."

Eager salesmen have managed to sell air-conditioners, freezers, water softeners, encyclopedias, and many miscellaneous items simply by convincing parents that their children's welfare would suf-

fer without them.

On a civic level, no traffic problem can be discussed without consideration of what will happen to the kiddies, recreation for the children is one of the hottest issues, and juvenile delinquency is a source of great concern.

There are few issues on which politicians cannot claim that their proposals will make this a better world for the children.

Churches embarking on new building programs usually construct an educational unit first and devote considerable time to youth work. Parents are urged to take part in character-building youth activities, ranging from the YMCA to Little League and Scouting. One of the most potent forces in town is the PTA.

The man who glanced at the breakdown on his tax bill cannot miss the fact that a sizeable share of his taxes are going for schools.

The launching of Sputnik brought great debates over the country's schools, with charges and counter-charges as to what the schools are or are not doing for children.

In many minds is the thought that since the older generation has made such a mess of things, maybe the children can do better. Junior stands by and watches as his elders battle over how he

shall be taught and what he shall be taught.

If Junior doesn't dominate our homes, he at least dominates our thoughts.

What are we going to make of him?

Or, what are we going to make him make of himself and the world?

## Torrance Herald

Established Jan. 1, 1914

Member of National Editorial Association, California Newspaper Publishers Association

Published Semi-Weekly, Thursday and Sunday. Entered as second class matter January 30, 1914, at Post Office, Torrance, California, under act of March 3, 1879.

KING WILLIAMS, Publisher. GLENN W. PFEIL, General Manager. REID L. BUNDT, Managing Editor.

Adjudicated a legal newspaper by Superior Court, Los Angeles County, Adjudicated Decree No. 218470, March 30, 1927.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: By Carrier, 45¢ a month. Mail subscriptions \$5.40 a year. Circulation Office PA 8-4000. NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION AFFILIATE MEMBER

STAR GAZER\*\* by CLAY R. POLLAN. Your Daily Activity Guide According to the Stars. To develop message for Thursday, read words corresponding to numbers of your Zodiac birth sign.

ABIES MAR 22	1 There's	31 And	61 A
APR 20	2 You	32 Be	62 Urges
5 MAY 21	3 Honesty	33 For	63 Let
19-25-30-38	4 Bodily	34 business	64 Better
73-74-75	5 An	35 Extravagant	65 Festivity
10-11-12-13-14	6 And	36 To	66 You
15-16-17-18	7 Effort	37 Anyone	67 To
19-20-21-22-23	8 Excellent	38 Courtship	68 Via
24-25-26-27-28	9 But	39 Appointment	69 Spend
29-30-31-32-33-34	10 Off	40 A	70 Over
35-36-37-38-39	11 Day	41 You	71 Days
40-41-42-43-44	12 Look	42 With	72 Appraise
45-46-47-48-49	13 To	43 Change	73 A
50-51-52-53-54	14 Now's	44 Can	74 Professional
55-56-57-58-59	15 Don't	45 May	75 Person
60-61-62-63-64	16 Personal	46 Pull	76 Your
65-66-67-68-69	17 Frankness	47 Revealing	77 Atmosphere
70-71-72-73-74	18 In	48 Accomplish	78 Assets
75-76-77-78-79	19 Make	49 Marriage	79 And
80-81-82-83-84	20 Today's	50 Of	80 House
85-86-87-88-89	21 Financial	51 Time	81 Your
90-91-92-93-94	22 Need	52 Wool	82 Shopping
95-96-97-98-99	23 Of	53 Of	83 Innermost
100-101-102-103-104	24 The	54 Interests	84 Eyes
105-106-107-108-109	25 An	55 Stay	85 Secret
110-111-112-113-114	26 Please	56 Financial	86 Well
115-116-117-118-119	27 Let	57 To	87 Backfire
120-121-122-123-124	28 Don't	58 Are	88 Secrets
125-126-127-128-129	29 Someone	59 Matters	89 Conferences
130-131-132-133-134	30 For	60 Until	90 Aspected
135-136-137-138-139	31 Good	61 Adverse	91 Not
140-141-142-143-144	32 Good	62 Adverse	92 Not